

REMARKS

Claims 10-15, 25, 27, 32-34, 66-68 and 70-72 are pending in this application. Applicants herewith amend claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 72. No claims are added or deleted. Thus, claims 10-15, 25, 27, 32-34, 66-68 and 70-72 are active in this case.

I. Rejections under 35 USC § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-15, 25, 27, 32-24, 66-68 and 70-72 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, for the alleged reason that the claimed subject matter is not described in the specification. According to the Examiner, the specification only describes one specific peptide, Y5D12 (SEQ ID NO: 11) in Figure 11 and on page 47, lines 26-35, having a Tyr residue at position 5, and Asp at position 12. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With regard to amended claim 10, applicants assert that support for this invention can be found at least on page 10, first paragraph *et seq.* Applicants have changed SEQ ID NO:15 to SEQ ID NO:14 and direct the Examiner's attention to the Substitute Sequence listing filed July 21, 2000.

II. Rejections under 35 USC § 102 (b) and § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-12, 14, 25, 27, 32, 33, 34, 68, 70, 71 and 72 as being anticipated by Gaudernack *et al.* (WO 92/14756). The Examiner directs applicants to page 32, lines 5-16. The Examiner further rejects the above claims under 35 USC § 103 over Gaudernack in view of Etlinger (EP 429 816). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as they may apply to the amended claims.

Gaudernack teaches ras peptides that have point mutations at either position 12 or 13. It does not teach a peptide having more than one mutation nor the specific substitutions presently claimed. Accordingly, Gaudernack fails to teach all of the claimed elements and therefore fails to support a rejection under 35 USC § 102. With

regard to the obviousness rejection, applicants respectfully point out that nothing in Etlinger cures the deficiencies in the primary reference, Gaudernack. Nothing in Gaudernack or Etlinger, alone or in combination, teaches the ras peptides of the present invention. Accordingly, one could not arrive at the claimed invention through this combination of art even if one were motivated to make such a combination. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and explanations, applicants respectfully request Examiner Canella to reconsider and withdraw all pending rejections and advance this case to allowance.

Examiner Canella is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for application for any reason related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept 6, 2006
Customer No. 44991
HELLER EHRMAN LLP
1717 Rhode Island Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-3001
Telephone: (202) 912-2000
Facsimile: (202) 912-2020

By Patricia D. Granados

Patricia D. Granados
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 33,683